

L8a2AllC kjc

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----x

3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

New York, N.Y.

4 v.

19 Cr. 833 (SHS)

5 CHAD ALLEN, *et al.*,

6 Defendants.

-----x

Conference

7 August 10, 2021
8 2:10 p.m.

9
10 Before:

11 HON. SIDNEY H. STEIN,

12 District Judge

13
14 APPEARANCES

15 AUDREY STRAUSS

16 United States Attorney for the
17 Southern District of New York

18 BY: KIERSTEN A. FLETCHER

19 SEBASTIAN SWETT

20 Assistant United States Attorneys

21 FOY & SEPLOWITZ, LLC

22 Attorneys for Defendant Allen

23 BY: JASON E. FOY

24 CHAUDHRY LAW, PLLC

25 Attorneys for Defendant Shah

BY: PRIYA CHAUDHRY

SETH ZUCKERMAN

STEPTOE & JOHNSON, LLP

Attorney for Defendant Brewster

BY: RYAN P. POSCABLO

L8a2AllC kjc

1 (Case called)

2 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please be reminded that, whether
3 you are present in the courthouse or listening to this
4 proceeding from elsewhere, the recording or broadcasting of it
5 in any manner is prohibited by law.

6 Counsel, please state your names for the record.

7 MS. FLETCHER: Good afternoon, your Honor. Kiersten
8 Fletcher and Sheb Swett for the government.

9 THE COURT: Good afternoon.

10 MR. SWETT: Good afternoon, your Honor.

11 MR. FOY: May it please the Court, Jason Foy for
12 Mr. Chad Allen, who is appearing via telephone with the
13 permission of the Court. Good afternoon.

14 THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.

15 MS. CHAUDHRY: Good afternoon, your Honor. Priya
16 Chaudhry, along with Seth Zuckerman, for Jenn Shah, who is
17 present and seated behind me.

18 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon.

19 MR. POSCABLO: Good afternoon, your Honor. Ryan
20 Poscablo, on behalf of Cameron Brewster, who is participating
21 by telephone.

22 THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please be seated in the
23 courtroom.

24 I have called this conference so that we could
25 establish a firm date for the trial. There has been some

L8a2AllC kjc

1 activity in the past day. Let me hear from the government. It
2 seems to me that we are moving toward a two-defendant October
3 18 trial. What's the position of the government?

4 MS. FLETCHER: Your Honor, I expect that there will
5 still be three remaining defendants in this case who wish to go
6 to trial. The activity that I think the court is referencing
7 is the unsealing of some guilty pleas, but the government was
8 incorporating those in our prior estimation that there will be
9 three defendants going to trial in this case.

10 THE COURT: Who are those three defendants?

11 MS. FLETCHER: The defendants whose counsel are
12 present today -- Chad Allen, Jennifer Shah, and Cameron
13 Brewster.

14 THE COURT: Mr. Foy, I believe you filed a letter
15 today, is that correct?

16 MR. FOY: No.

17 THE COURT: All right. Let's see. Let me just find
18 out.

19 MS. FLETCHER: Your Honor, I believe that Rich
20 Rosenberg filed a letter on behalf of his client, Shane Hanna.

21 THE COURT: Ah.

22 MS. FLETCHER: And Gil Athay has filed a letter on
23 behalf of his client, Stuart Smith. Neither of those
24 defendants have entered guilty pleas in this case, but the
25 government expects that both will, and so we did not include

L8a2AllC kjc

1 those in our prior list of the three defendants, and they are
2 not included today.

3 THE COURT: I see. That's my error.

4 (Pause)

5 THE COURT: We are just checking something in ECF.

6 Assuming that is the situation at this time, as the
7 parties are aware, the court has tightened up COVID protocols
8 in light of the Delta variant, and we don't know where that is
9 going to go. It is highly unlikely that we will be able to try
10 three defendants in a COVID-compliant courtroom. I had thought
11 we were dealing with Ms. Shah and Mr. Brewster. That would
12 make sense to stay with the October 18 date. If we are looking
13 at a three-defendant trial, I don't think we can do that on
14 October 18.

15 In addition, as the parties know, there has to be a
16 resumption of jury trials. As to the procedural views pursuant
17 to that, it is the committee's recommendation and the vote of
18 the Board of Judges -- and I think I explained this the last
19 time, so we have it recorded -- the judges submit a limited
20 number of requests for those COVID-compliant courtrooms, and I
21 have submitted a request for this case for October 18. Whereas
22 I cannot guarantee it will be allowed October 18, I think I can
23 pretty comfortably say that we will be allotted a slot on or
24 near that date. But we can't try three people and still be
25 COVID compliant, especially under the concerns of the Delta

L8a2AllC kjc

1 variant. Indeed, as those of you who have been following it,
2 there now is -- everybody has to be masked and everybody has to
3 maintain social distance. So that's where it now stands. If
4 indeed we are talking of three defendants, it looks like we are
5 not going to have a three-defendant trial in the fourth quarter
6 and we are going to have to put it over.

7 The last time the government was making an argument to
8 me about a small overlap. Now, I don't know if that involved
9 these three defendants or other defendants. What was the
10 government's position there?

11 MS. FLETCHER: Your Honor, it did involve these three
12 defendants. At the last conference, the government was
13 suggesting that, to the extent that the Court would not be able
14 to try three defendants any time soon and that certain of the
15 defendants wanted a trial date before that could happen, the
16 government views the proof in this case as easily split in a
17 particular way.

18 And to just shed a little bit more light on that,
19 Cameron Brewster and Jennifer Shah operated primarily in -- out
20 of Utah, and so they are closer to each other in the conspiracy
21 as charged than either defendant is to Chad Allen, who
22 primarily operated out of Arizona. And so to the extent the
23 Court was considering a way to sever the defendants poised to
24 go to trial, that would be a logical, efficient severance in
25 the government's estimation.

L8a2AllC kjc

1 We don't have yet a full sense of exactly who our
2 witnesses would be for each of them, but our current sense is
3 that if, for example, Chad Allen were to go to trial in October
4 of this year, there is only one witness who we think, as I sit
5 here now, stand here now, would likely testify again at a later
6 trial of defendants Shah and Brewster. Whereas, if the
7 evidence was split differently, meaning Shah and Brewster were
8 severed from each other, there would very likely be some
9 inefficiency, meaning multiple witnesses testifying twice,
10 which would equate to more trial days in total than the other
11 split proposed by the government.

12 THE COURT: Well, if indeed there are three defendants
13 going to trial, the Court has no interest in trying this case
14 twice, and I think what we are going to have to do is move it
15 over to -- no one is incarcerated, is that correct?

16 MS. FLETCHER: That is correct, your Honor.

17 THE COURT: Move it to the first quarter of 2022. My
18 working assumption is that COVID will still be with us and that
19 we will have to abide by the *ad hoc* committee allocation of the
20 COVID-compliant courtroom. It seems to me that that makes the
21 most sense.

22 Mr. Foy, you want today speak, sir.

23 MR. FOY: Yes, your Honor.

24 At the last court appearance I wasn't present because
25 I was preparing for a trial before Judge Ramos that ended on

L8a2AllC kjc

1 Friday, so I did want to at least inform the Court of my
2 particulars.

3 I agree that it should be first quarter, and I am also
4 going to encourage the Court to schedule it for the March of
5 the first quarter. And the reason why I am asking is, having
6 just completed a trial where my client was in custody for three
7 years and incarcerated, although I have three other clients who
8 are incarcerated who have been in jail for four years, and
9 although those are state court matters --

10 THE COURT: It's all the difference in the world. I
11 don't know where you are going with it, but it's all the
12 difference in the world for these purposes.

13 MR. FOY: Well, I'm going with the fact that I want to
14 be available in the fourth quarter to hopefully get some of
15 those clients tried who have been incarcerated.

16 THE COURT: Oh, I see. I see. All right. I thought
17 you were equating the two systems.

18 MR. FOY: No. Not at all.

19 THE COURT: In other words, you want to -- you have
20 work to do in the fourth quarter on that state issue.

21 MR. FOY: Correct, and that's why I am asking that
22 your Honor consider March of 2022, because hopefully that will
23 give me time to get through those three matters, plus take a
24 personal moment at some point.

25 THE COURT: Mr. Poscablo, what's happening with your

L8a2AllC kjc

1 other commitment in, I think, Chicago?

2 MR. FOY: Judge, I wish it were Chicago. It is in the
3 Southern District of Illinois, which is closer to Missouri. In
4 fact, it is at the Benton Courthouse. That is still active and
5 it is set for trial on the 24th of October. Pursuant to your
6 Honor's deputy's message to me, I did not yet indicate to that
7 court that I have a conflicting trial.

8 THE COURT: All right. What is the government's
9 position in terms of closer to March? And again, as long as
10 everybody knows, assuming the *ad hoc* committee process is still
11 at work -- I can't guarantee it -- but what's the position of
12 the government in terms of a request for the Court to put in
13 for a March trial date?

14 MS. FLETCHER: The government is fine with a March
15 date.

16 THE COURT: All right. We will do that, then.
17 How long does the government believe a three-defendant
18 trial will take?

19 MS. FLETCHER: I think for these three defendants it
20 will be three to four weeks, and that's not accounting for any
21 lengthy defense case.

22 THE COURT: All right. I will put in for a March 7
23 and that is the date that I am setting for trial here, 9:30
24 a.m.

25 I will have a final pretrial conference in this case

L8a2AllC kjc

1 on February 15 at 10 a.m.

2 The parties obviously can ask for a conference at any
3 time before that if something arises.

4 March 7, 9:30 a.m., commencement of trial. February
5 15, 10 a.m., for a final pretrial conference.

6 I think time -- pursuant to my order of April 2, time
7 is excluded until October 18 at this point.

8 MS. FLETCHER: Yes, it has been, your Honor, and the
9 government would move to exclude Speedy Trial Act time between
10 today's date through March 7, 2022, the date currently set for
11 trial. The government submits that exclusion of time is in the
12 interests of justice to allow the parties to prepare for trial
13 and to continue any ongoing discussions regarding resolutions.

14 THE COURT: Mr. Foy, what's your position?

15 MR. FOY: I have no objection, your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Ms. Chaudhry, what's your position?

17 MS. CHAUDHRY: Your Honor, I have no objection to
18 that, but I did want to be heard on this trial schedule.

19 THE COURT: Oh. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

20 MS. CHAUDHRY: Your Honor, Ms. Shah would like to have
21 this trial proceed as soon as possible and was really looking
22 forward to an October date. I understand that the world is not
23 in any of our control anymore. We have to accept what is
24 safest for everyone. That said, with a March 7 trial date, I
25 think it's reasonable for us to anticipate that on that date

L8a2AllC kjc

1 only two defendants will be able to begin their trial, and so I
2 would like to address that issue now, that if, as we get close
3 and this becomes two separate trial dates, Ms. Shah would like
4 that March 7 trial date, if that's the first one available and
5 if there is going to be a second trial, she wants the date, the
6 March 7 date.

7 THE COURT: If I understand you, your client's
8 position is she wants to be tried, to have her day in court as
9 soon as possible.

10 MS. CHAUDHRY: Correct.

11 THE COURT: All right. Certainly. And now I am
12 adjourning the trial until March 7. And what you are saying is
13 if at that point there still are three defendants here and we
14 can't have a three-defendant trial, she wants priority. I
15 understand her request. It is nothing I need to do now.

16 MS. CHAUDHRY: Okay. Thank you.

17 THE COURT: As we get closer, if that is still the
18 situation, you will remind me of that.

19 MS. CHAUDHRY: Thank you, your Honor. And then when
20 we are done with this point, I would like to address a few more
21 things.

22 THE COURT: All right.

23 MR. POSCABLO: No objection from Mr. Brewster.

24 THE COURT: Okay. I hereby exclude time from
25 calculation under the Speedy Trial Act from today until March

L8a2AllC kjc

1 7, 2022. The government has made the motion and each of the
2 three defendants' counsel present here has stated they have no
3 objection to the exclusion. I do find that the ends of justice
4 served by this continuance outweigh the best interests of the
5 public and the defendants in this indictment in a Speedy Trial.
6 The solution is made pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3161(h)(7)(A). It's
7 an interests-of-justice exclusion.

8 Ms. Chaudhry, you said there was something else?

9 MS. CHAUDHRY: Yes, your Honor, two issues related to
10 the bill of particulars motion that we had filed and this
11 Court's ruling.

12 So as the parties recall, on the hearing for the bill
13 of particulars motion, on July 23, which was argued by
14 Mr. Alonso of the Buckley firm, the Court indicated during the
15 argument that the government should be providing the defense
16 with more information. At the hearing the government
17 represented that it would; and, based on those representations,
18 as indicated in your Honor's order, the Court denied our
19 request for a motion for particulars, but denied it without
20 prejudice.

21 And I cite to, as your Honor is aware, page three of
22 your order, at paragraph two, where you state, "At oral
23 argument, the defense affirmed that it would continue to relay
24 specific discovery requests to the government and the
25 government affirmed that it would continue to work with the

L8a2AllC kjc

1 defense to provide requested information. Because the defense
2 has received and will continue to receive information from the
3 government that will assist them in preparing their defense,
4 the motion to compel a bill of particulars is denied without
5 prejudice."

6 Following that hearing, on July 27, the government
7 provided Ms. Shah's counsel with a list of 59 individuals and
8 entities; and, in response to that letter, I sent the
9 government a letter asking for clarification of who these
10 entities are on July 29, and specifically I referenced your
11 direction at the July 23 hearing and I asked who -- essentially
12 who this list is. I said would you break this list down in
13 categories so that we can meaningfully understand it and
14 prepare for trial, and I also asked if this list included any
15 victims.

16 THE COURT: What are you saying the list of
17 50-some-odd entities and individuals was? How was it presented
18 to you by the government?

19 MS. CHAUDHRY: A letter with a cover letter that said,
20 "The government further writes to update you on its current
21 view that the scheme charged in the superseding indictment as
22 related to the defendant includes the following individuals and
23 entities," colon and then a list of 59 names.

24 THE COURT: All right.

25 MS. CHAUDHRY: So I essentially asked who are these

L8a2AllC kjc

1 people and what should I make of them? And after I sent in my
2 letter, your Honor issued his order. And following your order,
3 the government replied to my letter, and on August 6 they wrote
4 to me and said, "First, you asked that the government break
5 this list down in categories," and their position was, "The
6 government has no obligation to do so and the Court declined to
7 require as much."

8 Later they write, "Second, you asked that we let you
9 know immediately if and when the government plans to provide a
10 list of alleged victims," and their response is, "The
11 government has no obligation to do so and the Court declined to
12 rule as much."

13 And so, your Honor, we find ourselves in the same
14 position in that all of the questions I asked about this latest
15 group of names that has been given to us without any meaning to
16 it, added to the millions of other names and documents, be --
17 provide some sort of category or outline.

18 THE COURT: I understand.

19 MS. CHAUDHRY: We find ourselves in the position that
20 I am now again having to ask the Court to intervene, because at
21 this point I can see that this is -- that was the response we
22 were getting, following our hearing, following the Court's
23 direction, it is still the response we are getting, and
24 therefore it is the response I expect to keep getting, and we
25 are going to find ourselves in the same position of not really

L8a2AllC kjc

1 knowing who, what, where, when, why, to begin our trial
2 preparation.

3 THE COURT: All right. Well, a bill of particulars is
4 not designed to give you a who, what, when, where, and why.
5 You know that. It is designed to enable you to respond to the
6 charges and to prepare for trial.

7 But let me hear from the government.

8 MS. FLETCHER: Yes, your Honor.

9 I think the summary Ms. Chaudhry gave ignores a couple
10 of things.

11 First, the initial list that the government provided
12 to Ms. Shah's prior counsel was provided with an explanation
13 that these are individuals and entities responsive to their
14 question of who are the coconspirators, what are the sales
15 floors, and what are the fulfillment companies. That's what
16 the list of individuals is, and that is been conveyed as much
17 to prior counsel, so Ms. Chaudhry is aware of what the list is
18 designed to represent.

19 THE COURT: Did you break it out? You said it was
20 fulfillment houses. What else? Victims, coconspirators?

21 MS. FLETCHER: No, not victims, your Honor. I think
22 victims is a separate category that was discussed at length
23 during oral argument, and I am happy to address again. But the
24 list -- I believe it was initially 41 individuals and entities
25 that are the defendant's coconspirators, sales floors with whom

L8a2AllC kjc

1 she worked, and fulfillment companies.

2 After the conference, the government, in line with the
3 Court's directive during the conference, sought to update the
4 list based on its current thinking and the extent to which its
5 investigation has progressed since the prior list. So I'm not
6 sure why this is even coming to the Court's attention because
7 it's clear what was asked for, and the government has provided
8 that and has continued to update it in a good-faith effort to
9 comply with the Court's suggestion that we address questions as
10 they come in.

11 THE COURT: Well, I take it, I mean you are all -- I
12 don't want to phrase it that way.

13 Is it clear from your list who are the alleged
14 coconspirators, which are the sales floors, and which are the
15 fulfillment houses?

16 MS. FLETCHER: Your Honor, the coconspirators are the
17 individuals, so the names of people on the list.

18 THE COURT: All right. That gives Ms. Chaudhry
19 information. The individuals on the list of names,
20 individuals, as opposed to the entities, are your alleged
21 coconspirators. Is that what you are saying?

22 MS. FLETCHER: Yes, your Honor.

23 THE COURT: All right. Excellent.

24 Next.

25 MS. FLETCHER: And the entities are sales floors

L8a2AllC kjc

1 and/or fulfillment companies. Some are only one of the two and
2 some are both. And so the government didn't bucket them
3 because some are one of the two and some are both. And again,
4 these are all entities with which the defendant is familiar.
5 So to the extent that the government may think it is one and in
6 fact it is both, the entities are sales floors and fulfillment
7 companies.

8 THE COURT: Go ahead.

9 MS. FLETCHER: So, your Honor, that is the list which
10 is now 59 individuals, and it is the list that the government
11 will continue to update as its investigation progresses as part
12 of our good-faith discussions with Ms. Chaudhry and with any
13 defense counsel who wants information about specifically what
14 evidence they should be focusing on.

15 The list of victims, your Honor, I think, was the
16 subject of a rather lengthy discussion during oral argument. I
17 think the Court was trying to ascertain whether there is a list
18 of victims somewhere in the government's possession that we are
19 holding on to and just not handing over, and what I think
20 AUSA Sobelman conveyed to the Court, which was true, is that it
21 is not as though there is a list in any one place, but the list
22 of victims primarily exists, as the government understands it,
23 in e-mail communications, in Google drive accounts that contain
24 company documents, in -- the names of victims might occur, you
25 know, on an individual sort of one-off basis in the context of

L8a2AllC kjc

1 chat communications or text communications among
2 coconspirators. It is not as though there is one list of
3 victims anywhere.

4 But, again, as AUSA Sobelman pointed out, the records
5 that sort of make up the universe of victims in this case are
6 the defendant's records, her communications.

7 THE COURT: Is it the government's position that each
8 customer of each sales floor operated by the coconspirators --
9 is it the position of the government that each customer of each
10 of the sales floors constitutes a victim?

11 MS. FLETCHER: So, your Honor, AUSA Sobelman said last
12 time, I think, this is an "all or most" case. So it's
13 conceivable that there is an individual who purchased the
14 services that were offered by the various sales floors here who
15 did not in fact have to be lied to in order to purchase the
16 services, and so I think there is a question about whether that
17 individual is a victim.

18 But if the Court is asking is this a scheme that
19 covers the entire operation of the business such that any
20 individual was likely an intended victim of the scheme, the
21 government's view is yes.

22 THE COURT: All right. That's helpful.

23 What else in response to Ms. Chaudhry?

24 MS. FLETCHER: Your Honor, I think that addresses it,
25 except to say, now that we have a March trial date, the

L8a2AllC kjc

1 government is and remains prepared to address questions about
2 evidence as they come in from Ms. Chaudhry and from counsel
3 representing Ms. Shah's codefendants, and we will continue to
4 do so in good faith.

5 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

6 Ms. Chaudhry, that gives you some more clarification,
7 it seems to me, in terms of the victims and in terms of who
8 those individuals and entities were, and you have the
9 representation of the government that they are prepared to work
10 with you. On the dates you gave me, I think you said the
11 government's response was August 6. That was Friday, today is
12 Tuesday, so it sounds like things are moving forward.

13 MS. CHAUDHRY: We are trying your Honor.

14 Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Fletcher. We appreciate
15 that.

16 THE COURT: And this is the sort of thing,
17 Ms. Chaudhry, that I think would be handled by the parties and
18 the government.

19 MS. CHAUDHRY: Yes, noted, and we will take that note
20 going forward.

21 Your Honor, there is one more thing if I can please
22 address.

23 THE COURT: Please.

24 MS. CHAUDHRY: Your order dated August 5, the first
25 sentence of it, if I may quote, you write that -- this is the

L8a2AllC kjc

1 order denying our bill of particulars motion. You write that
2 "the indictment in this action charges 13 defendants with
3 participating in an extensive, long-running telemarketing fraud
4 conspiracy that sold millions of dollars of essentially
5 nonexistent services and products to elderly, unsophisticated
6 consumers."

7 THE COURT: That's what the indictment says.

8 MS. CHAUDHRY: So -- precisely.

9 THE COURT: Certainly the Court is not putting its
10 *imprimatur* on that. That's for the jury.

11 MS. CHAUDHRY: Precisely, your Honor. We assumed that
12 this is not the personal view of the court.

13 THE COURT: Not at all. Read that again. I hope I
14 said "the government charges." What did I -- what did I write?

15 MS. CHAUDHRY: You said "the indictment in this action
16 charges."

17 THE COURT: Yes. All right. I'm saying this is what
18 the government claims.

19 MS. CHAUDHRY: Precisely.

20 THE COURT: The Court has no view whatsoever on the
21 merits of the allegation --

22 MS. CHAUDHRY: I --

23 THE COURT: -- nor will it at any time. That's for
24 the jury.

25 MS. CHAUDHRY: Absolutely, your Honor. That's not my

L8a2AllC kjc

1 point.

2 My point was that I had assumed that this is the
3 Court's conclusion that that is the theory the government is
4 pursuing in this indictment, that these are essentially
5 nonexistent services and products, that that's the fraud here.

6 And the reason I am bringing this up is that, as the
7 Court recalls from the extensive argument on July 23, the
8 defense has been genuinely confused as to what the exact theory
9 of the fraud is, because there are so many people, so many
10 sales floors, so many different things involved. So we just
11 wanted to confirm with the government that this is in fact
12 their theory regarding Ms. Shah. Because if that is their
13 theory, then we can start mounting our strategy, investigation,
14 trial preparation, accordingly.

15 If, however, the government intends to pursue other
16 theories or offer alternative jury charges based on other
17 theories, we would ask for the government to state that now.
18 Because we did not see any letter from the government in
19 response to your Honor's order that disagrees with that theory
20 of the case, we just wanted to confirm that that is their
21 theory of the case so that we are not surprised later during
22 trial.

23 THE COURT: Well, from the standpoint of the Court I
24 set forth my understanding of what the government was
25 charging.

L8a2AllC kjc

1 Ms. Fletcher, what would you like to say, if
2 anything?

3 MS. FLETCHER: Your Honor, the government's theory of
4 the case has been a matter of discussion between the government
5 and Ms. Shah's prior counsel. We had a number of lengthy
6 conversations that were referenced in our filings with the
7 Court about how exactly the government views the so-called
8 services and products that were provided.

9 Appreciating that Ms. Chaudhry has not been in this
10 case for very long, apart from seeing each other in court, we
11 have spoken exactly zero times. And so to the extent
12 Ms. Chaudhry would like to discuss with the government our view
13 of the case, we are happy to entertain those discussions, but
14 we don't view that as a matter properly brought before the
15 Court today.

16 THE COURT: It seems to me that that's right,
17 Ms. Chaudhry. I set forth what the indictment charges, and I
18 think when you want substantiation of what the government --
19 how the government intends to prove its allegations, you can
20 have those discussions with Ms. Fletcher or Mr. Swett or
21 Mr. Sobelman.

22 I think it also makes sense -- I think prior to a few
23 days ago, it was Mr. Alonso who was carrying the bulk of the
24 defense, and he has withdrawn now. So you may also want to
25 speak with him, as I am sure you have, to get more detail about

L8a2AllC kjc

1 his discussions with the government to the extent they weren't
2 recorded. There may be he may have handwritten notes or typed
3 notes or something that he can assist you on. But my guess is
4 that that discussion was moving forward while Mr. Alonso was
5 the primary defense counsel, if I can use that term. Does that
6 make sense?

7 MS. CHAUDHRY: It does, your Honor. I just note that
8 it seemed to me that to the Court it seemed very clear what the
9 indictment is charging, and I have now --

10 THE COURT: It is. But how the government is going to
11 go about proving its case or what its specific theory is, speak
12 with them. This is my interpretation of the indictment. I
13 actually thought that that sentence was one of the -- was
14 pretty plain vanilla.

15 MS. CHAUDHRY: As did I. And if we could live in that
16 world, it would be easy to prepare the defense; but, as I just
17 heard, the government said, maybe, maybe not.

18 THE COURT: Well, speak with them. Speak with them.
19 I'm not going to try the case in a pretrial conference.

20 MS. CHAUDHRY: That's fair. Thank you, your Honor.

21 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

22 Anything else from any of the defense attorneys?
23 Anything from the government? Nothing.

24 MS. FLETCHER: No, thank you, your Honor.

25 THE COURT: All right. Well, I will see everybody on

L8a2AllC kjc

1 the final pretrial conference date or any time before that, and
2 to the extent there are additional consensual dispositions, if
3 there are any, you certainly can contact my chambers, and I
4 will set a conference for the taking of a plea.

5 Thank you. I appreciate it.

6 oOo